

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_99645</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>New insights into the platform-to-basin anatomy of the Urganian Bas-Vivarais domain (Lower Cretaceous; SE France)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript titled "New insights into the platform-to-basin anatomy of the Urganian Bas-Vivarais domain (Lower Cretaceous; SE France)" provides important information on the chronostratigraphic model of the southern France Urganian-type carbonate platforms. The author has done an extensive job in investigating the evolution of the Bas-Vivarais Urganian domain along an inner-to-outer platform profile. However, during the review, some issues were observed that need to be addressed to improve the manuscript.</p> <p><b>Aim, objective and methodology:</b> The manuscript should include the aim, objective, and methodology used for the research in the abstract. This will help readers understand the research question and how the author arrived at the findings. Also, the conclusion part in the abstract does not fully represent the work that was carried out optimally. The author should provide a more comprehensive conclusion that summarizes the findings and highlights their significance.</p> <p><b>Geology and stratigraphy:</b> The geology and stratigraphy should be more explained, and the labels in the diagram should be bolder so that the readers can see them clearly. This will help readers understand the study area better and how the author arrived at the findings.</p> <p><b>Chronology:</b> The author did a fantastic job, but did not talk extensively about the chronology of the basin as related to the findings. The author should provide more information on the chronology of the basin, including the age of the rocks, to help readers understand the time frames in the geological formation.</p> <p><b>Hydrocarbon potential:</b> The author should reflect on the hydrocarbon potential of the basin and its economic viability. This will provide readers with an idea of the economic importance of the findings and how it can be used to benefit society.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The manuscript is not well concluded, and the conclusion should reflect more details of the research findings. The author should provide a more comprehensive conclusion that summarizes the findings and highlights their significance.</p> <p>In summary, the manuscript provides important information on the chronostratigraphic model of the southern France Urganian-type carbonate platforms. However, the issues outlined above need to be addressed to improve the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Recommended for publication</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adeola Akinrinmade</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Hikmah University, Nigeria</b>